



NCI | CeNC

NATIONAL CITIZENS INQUIRY

**EVIDENCE
VANCOUVER HEARINGS**

NCI | CeNC

**Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
May 2 to 4, 2023**

ABOUT THESE TRANSCRIPTS

The evidence offered in these transcripts is a true and faithful record of witness testimony given during the National Citizens Inquiry (NCI) hearings. These hearings took place in eight Canadian cities from coast to coast from March through May 2023.

Raw transcripts were initially produced from the audio-video recordings of witness testimony and legal and commissioner questions using Open AI's Whisper speech recognition software. From May to August 2023, a team of volunteers assessed the AI transcripts against the recordings to edit, review, format, and finalize all NCI witness transcripts.

With utmost respect for the witnesses, the volunteers worked to the best of their skills and abilities to ensure that the transcripts would be as clear, accurate, and accessible as possible. Edits were made using the "intelligent verbatim" transcription method, which removes filler words and other throat-clearing, false starts, and repetitions that could distract from the testimony content.

Many testimonies were accompanied by slide show presentations or other exhibits. The NCI team recommends that transcripts be read together with the video recordings and any corresponding exhibits.

We are grateful to all our volunteers for the countless hours committed to this project, and hope that this evidence will prove to be a useful resource for many in future. For a complete library of the over 300 testimonies at the NCI, please visit our website at <https://nationalcitizensinquiry.ca>.

TRANSCRIPT TEAM (English)

Managing Editor
Jodi Bruhn

Transcript Coordinators
Debbie Palmer, Erin Thiessen

Formatting and Analysis Leads
Veronica Bush, Melissa Neville

Whisper AI Transcript Creation
Madison Lowe

First Review

Anjum Ahmad-Donovan, Bill Allwright, Lisa Aschenbrenner, Anne Marie Baxter, Vanessa Behrens-Nicholls, Pamela Boese, Yvonne Cunnington, Michael Darmody, Teresa Dockstader, Heather Domik, Rita Mae Ewanchuk, Chantal Gutfriend, Monika Harynuk, Michelle Hughes, Karen Kimmet, Kathy Ladd, Lori Morrison, Ronald Mucklestone, Melissa Neville, Debbie Palmer, Joanne Plamondon, Susan Reh-Bosch, Elisa Rolston, Tanja Shields, Ronald Simpson, Elizabeth Sleight, Al Smigelski, Darlene Smigelski, Barbara Spencer, Dawn Sutherland Dort, Christine Taylor, Evelyne Therrien, Erin Thiessen, Ada VandenBerg, Rich VandenBerg, Sally Williams

Second Review

Veronica Bush, Elizabeth van Dreunen, Brigitte Hamilton, Rosalee Krahn, Val Sprott

Final Review

Jodi Bruhn, Anna Cairns, Margaret Phillips



NATIONAL CITIZENS INQUIRY

Vancouver, BC

Day 2

May 3, 2023

EVIDENCE

Opening Statement: Shawn Buckley

Full Day 2 Timestamp: 01:26:58–01:57:53

Source URL: <https://rumble.com/v2ltjw4-national-citizens-inquiry-vancouver-day-2.html>

[00:00:00]

Shawn Buckley

We'd like to welcome you back to the National Citizens Inquiry as we begin Day 2 of our hearings in Vancouver, British Columbia. Commissioners, for the record, my name is Buckley, initial S. I'm attending as agent this morning for the Inquiry Administrator, the Honourable Ches Crosbie.

I'd like to introduce what the NCI is for those that are participating who have not heard about us. We are a citizen-organized and -run group of volunteers that have decided to put together an independent inquiry to literally travel across the country. Here we are on the West Coast to inquire independently what happened in the last three years and how can we do this better but more importantly to give Canadians a voice.

One interesting thing is that as we've travelled across, we've run across witness after witness after witness who has dropped out at the very last minute because they're afraid. They're afraid of economic repercussions at work. They're afraid of social consequences from their friends and family. They're afraid of shaming online because their story does not go in line with the government narrative. We had a doctor at our last set of hearings in Red Deer who said, on the stand, "I expect there's going to be repercussions. I'm stepping out to tell the truth." Because there's actually a cost for not telling the truth. There's a cost to us—inside—for staying silent and pretending that a lie is truth.

I'm just stating this so that you understand that the witnesses that are testifying, many of them are afraid. But it's so important to them to tell their stories and it's so important for you to hear their stories. We're getting thank you, after thank you, after thank you from these witnesses because they feel relieved that they've been heard. Because we need to be heard. It's part of the human condition to have a voice. So we are thankful that you're participating. Understand that your participation is important because it gives the people testifying a voice.

I'm always asked by our organization to please, please, please go to our website, National Citizens Inquiry; sign our petition. We want that to have a large number of signatures so that it shows that the public is behind this. We also ask that you would donate, and there's

ways of donating online on our website because this is citizen-funded. We don't have a single large donor. Every set of hearings of three days costs us roughly about \$35,000, and it's truly amazing that we're here. We just stay ahead of paying our bills. At our last meeting earlier this week, it's like, well, we don't have enough to finish; we really do need people to keep funding. But it's happening and it's exciting. I feel honoured and grateful to be a part of what's happening here. I'm volunteering. And it's just exciting to be a part of, really, what's become a movement.

Now I'm going to start with a little bit of comedy today, but it's real-life comedy. I am very, very pleased to announce that today is the United Nations World Press Freedom Day. And the United Nation reports, about this Freedom Day, that freedom of expression is the driver of all human rights. Now the sad part about that is that it's true. Freedom of expression is the driver of all human rights. Whenever we experience censorship, we should be trained: we should be trained to resist and to stand up and not allow it to happen. Every single citizen of Canada has a responsibility to stand against censorship of all types. It doesn't matter if the voice is a voice you support or whether it's a voice that you don't support—so the part of you that goes, "Well, I'm glad that person's being censored." No. Because censorship leads to slavery. If we don't have a voice, which is what the NCI is all about,

[00:05:00]

we end up in tyranny. Time after time after time, history has shown us that. You are going to really appreciate our first witness this morning, who's going to have some things to say on tyranny and police states and where Canada is.

But you laughed when I said this was United Nations World Press Freedom Day because it is somewhat ironic. We could ask, for the last three years, where was the United Nations when in Canada voice after voice that went against the government narrative was being censored as misinformation and professionals like doctors and nurses were losing their credentials for speaking out? Where, literally, we had corporatism—corporatism—in our media.

We have government-funded media, the CBC. But we have mainstream media that in the private sector should be competing amongst themselves and should be competing with the government broadcaster CBC. We would think we would then have different voices. This was the most important and impactful experience of our lives as Canadians, this COVID experience. We would have expected to have different viewpoints and debate and scientific debate in our media. But we had one voice. We had one voice and that was the government voice. And we had the media actually participating in censorship. That, in my opinion, happened because of corporatism.

Just so you understand the word corporatism. That is a word to describe where the interests of corporations and the interests of governments become intertwined so that they basically start working together. So the word is corporatism. Now when that happens, when government and industry start working together—which would explain why the media spoke basically just with one voice and that was the government's voice—when that happens, there's another term for it. For those of you who are aware of the Italian dictator, Mussolini, he would correct people and say, "Don't use the word corporatism; a better word to describe that state of affairs is fascism." It's interesting because fascism is now one of the buzzwords that to censor people, you're labelled a fascist. So we label people with that term. But the term is just meant to describe the state of affairs where corporate and government interests merge, and it creates a situation where the public interest isn't served.

It's with some irony that we have World Press Freedom Day this week, when last week the Senate passed and the Governor General signed into law Bill C-11, which would allow the government for the first time to censor the internet. So we truly are in a Brave New World. I wonder if this adventure— Here we are, the National Citizens Inquiry, allowing people, allowing ordinary Canadians to take the stand, allowing expert witnesses to take the stand and give a voice to opinions that go against the government narrative. We know the trajectory is for this to become illegal, for there actually to be sanctions. I wonder if even a year from now, if in May of 2024, if it will be legal to do what we're doing today because we have a clear trajectory. And as I shared with you yesterday, we are being censored.

This is an incredible adventure. Nowhere in history has a group of citizens gotten together in any country, appointed independent commissioners, and somehow managed to march them across the land, having the world's best experts testify and having ordinary citizens share heart-wrenching stories. This should be front-page news. Every single day that we have a hearing day like today, this should be front-page news. We should have three or four camera crews in here. Instead of the two media tables we have that are empty, we should have five or six media tables. But they're not here, and they're not here for a reason. And we know what that reason is—because they're not allowed to go against the government narrative.

[00:10:00]

I shared with you how we're being censored on social media. And even how Twitter, which is supposed to be now the one platform that is not censored, that we seem to be search censored. People have sent us screenshots where they have done a search for the NCI on Twitter and we're not coming up. Yet other people do the search and we do come up. So I would ask again—I think it's appropriate—let us celebrate World Press Freedom Day by continuing to contact Elon Musk on Twitter and asking him to take off all restrictions on the National Citizens Inquiry and to start promoting the National Citizens Inquiry. Let us all celebrate World Press Freedom Day by tweeting out anything that you do remotely related to us and tagging NCI, hashtag NCI. And use your other social media programs. We have to get it out there. This is totally reliant on you. If we can get the country watching this—and we're getting more and more and more, it's incredible—then we can come together as a country.

Because there's a real problem with the truth. There's just a fundamental problem and there's nothing we can do about it. The reality is that truth resonates. And you can't stop it. It's a problem for the government, which is why we have censorship. If we can get people watching this, watching the truth, it's going to resonate.

Now I want to segue. We had Alan Cassels on the stand yesterday, and he's an expert in evaluating pharmaceutical drugs with the *Food and Drugs Act* and the drug approval process. I quite enjoyed him because I practise in that area or have practised in that area extensively in my legal career, and he and I had a bit of a dialogue. He made it very clear our drug laws are to protect intellectual property rights. Let that sink in. So Health Canada that manages our drug laws, they are there to protect intellectual property rights. I've lectured on that also. They're not there to protect our health. You cannot find in the *Food and Drugs Act* or regulations anything telling Health Canada that they are there to protect your health. There's not even a duty on them to act in the public interest. It is not there.

He explained how they are largely funded by the pharmaceutical industry. So they know where their bread is buttered. They refer to the pharmaceutical industry—and I've seen it in Health Canada emails that I've had disclosed to me during files—they refer to the

pharmaceutical industry as their “client.” There’s an absolute conflict of interest with Health Canada approving drugs that are to be used by the Canadian public. It’s literally the fox guarding the hen house and it is corporatism. So we basically have a situation where the interests of the pharmaceutical corporations and the interests of the government regulator, Health Canada, are aligned. Because the government regulator, most of their money, their salaries, comes from the pharmaceutical companies.

Health Canada is the organization that you have relied on, that you have trusted, when they told you that the COVID-19 vaccines were safe and effective. When they weren’t telling you, well, actually, the approval test didn’t even mention the word safe and effective. So your health and the health of your family, for those of you that chose to get the vaccine, basically depended on your trust of an organization that is not there to protect your health—that is not there in the public interest—but is there to protect intellectual property rights and has a conflict of interest with the pharmaceutical companies.

He is deceased now, but he was a champion of truth, Dr. Shiv Chopra. He was a drug approval scientist for Health Canada for 30 years. For a period of time, he ran the veterinary branch of their drug approval process. But he worked most of his career on human drug applications.

[00:15:00]

He became a whistleblower over adding growth hormones to our dairy and into our dairy herd. He forced the Senate to call—I think it was four—drug approval scientists that worked at Health Canada to speak about conflict of interest in Health Canada. He wrote a book about this called *Corrupt to the Core*, which you can access. You can still get copies online, used copies.

But I remember one of the drug approval scientists, Dr. Margaret Hayden, gave an interview at the CBC after she was forced to testify. And it was chilling. She said after you’ve been a drug approval scientist at Health Canada for a period of time, you get to learn how they’re going to get around your recommendation that it’s not in the public interest to approve a drug—so, basically, the risks outweigh the benefits. And she says, “Well, what happens is that the management who are not doctors and who are not scientists, they will appoint an outside panel of experts.” So panel of experts outside of Health Canada. “This panel of experts will then review the drug approval submission. They will recommend that the drug get approved and then the management will approve it based on these expert recommendations.” And so these poor drug approval scientists in Health Canada. Can you imagine the moral distress because they’re seeing that it’s not in the public interest to approve a drug? Yet then, as soon as they say no, there’s this pattern that they anticipate will happen: because it happens enough that she describes it as a pattern. This is the organization that, basically, you put your trust in.

I wanted to share with you my experience with Health Canada. It’s really my road to Damascus experience. It’s funny. I used to lecture and I would use that phrase, “It was my road to Damascus experience.” Twenty-five years ago, I could use that phrase and everyone in the audience knew what I was talking about. But I’ve recently learned—because our education system has deliberately excluded our Christian history and the Christian values that support our legal system upon which our society is based—it’s been deliberately excluded. This isn’t about whether you believe in God or don’t believe in God. Our society is based on principles that flow from the Christian experience. And if you want to undermine our society, you don’t teach our history; you don’t teach why we have that.

I had given an opening in Red Deer explaining how the second commandment is the foundation of our legal system. The second commandment is simply that you love your neighbour like yourself. In other words that you treat your neighbour, you treat other people, in the exact same way that you want to be treated. It's only societies based on that principle that are free. You can go and watch that opening, and I might explain it a little later. But I feel the need to explain "road to Damascus." We have these cultural references. When you hear, "Oh, that's my road to Damascus experience," or "I saw the light." That's another phrase that we hear, "Oh, yeah, I saw the light." You know it means somebody changed their mind.

But I'll share the story with you just so that you understand. So Christ had been crucified and He'd risen from the grave, and He'd been on earth interacting with people for about 40 days and He ascends to heaven. But the disciples and the Christians that were left behind, they were on fire. They were going all over the place preaching about Jesus. This posed a real problem for the religious authorities because they were rule-based. Their religious system was rule after rule after rule, starting with the Ten Commandments. And the religious authorities used it as a tool, really. It became oppressive, much like we're experiencing today.

I was out for supper last night and two different people at the table live rurally, one in British Columbia and one in Quebec. And they're both sharing with me how every animal now has to be reported. So you have to get every chicken, every chicken registered, and they're actually limiting how many animals you can have. This is to take control of our food supply and to ensure that people can't be self-sufficient. But it's just an example of how these rules are coming down on us and being oppressive.

[00:20:00]

Well, in Jesus' day, it was the same thing; it was just downright oppressive. He became a huge threat because He's basically speaking about the rules; they called it the law, although they're religious rules. He's speaking about them in such a way that was freeing. And so the second commandment, He's saying, ignore all these rules. Well, not ignore them, but He's saying if you love God and you love your neighbour like yourself, that is all the rules. It's as simple as that. All these rules are just really specifics on how to love your neighbour. That's all it is. And that's a much more freeing way. Because if our rules are just to love our neighbour, then we end up in a free society. Because societies that are based on treating others as you would treat yourself, first of all—they're not murdering each other; they're not stealing; they're not sleeping with somebody else's spouse because they don't want their spouse sleeping with somebody else. They're treating others as they would treat themselves, and it creates a free society.

So Jesus was this upstart, and that's why they killed Him, to get rid of Him. It didn't work. They had the same problem with the disciples and new converts; they were going about saying the same thing. So they had to stamp out these Christians. One of the leaders doing this was a man named Saul. He had just participated in persecuting Christians in one place—they had stoned Stephen to death. He's now on the road to Damascus to find the Christians in Damascus and basically persecute them and put them in line. Killing people—like stoning Stephen—that sends a strong message to others. "Don't you dare convert to this." It's fear. "Don't you convert."

So he's on his way to Damascus to find and kill Christians, and he's blinded by light. There's this bright light and he's literally blinded by it. And out of the light comes a voice, "Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?" And he's like, "Who are you?" And He says, "Well, I'm

Jesus who you're persecuting." And now he's converted because he realizes he's on the wrong side. He has to change his mind.

Changing your mind actually is a physical thing. When you have your mind made up strongly about something, you actually have neurons wired in your brain. A belief you don't even have to think about. It's a belief: just bang, it's there. No, I believe this. There's no thought; there's no decision.

But when you change your mind on a belief, your mind actually changes: it takes physical energy; you have to rewire different neurons. So he changed his mind. That was his—it's a conversion. When you hear the phrase "road to Damascus experience," or "I've seen the light," it's referring to this story. So it's a social reference.

Now my road to Damascus experience with Health Canada involved an herbalist named Jim Strauss. In 1994, I was working at a law firm that had the federal contract in the area; it was in the interior British Columbia. An herbalist named Jim Strauss was suing Health Canada—he was importing herbs from the United States—and Health Canada hated this guy because he was selling unapproved products. But the whole natural health product industry was illegal. Back in 1984, if you walked into a health food store, 100 per cent illegal, literally, because our drug regulations didn't allow for it. So he's importing these herbs, perfectly legal for him to import. But because Health Canada hated this guy, they seized the herbs at the border and took them. Now there's a very technical legal term to describe what just happened and that's theft.

So Jim Strauss was suing Health Canada to get his herbs back. I get the file, and I'm talking to Health Canada. I'll let you know I got permission from Health Canada before I left that firm to actually talk about this. So I'm not violating solicitor-client privilege. But I mean, basically, their position was, "Can you believe how dangerous it is to have a rogue herbalist?" That was the term, basically selling treatments that people would come to rely on. Well, I'm a young pup; I'm just soaking all this in: "Yeah, this is dangerous as can be, what a rogue." I go to court and I have this case thrown out because he's in the wrong court. But he and I got along like really well.

[00:25:00]

Actually, he took me out for lunch after I had his case thrown out of court, which speaks to his character.

I leave that firm and I start my own firm. And then he gets charged with practising medicine without a licence. And so he hired me to defend him. There's a provincial law that says only doctors can practise medicine, and it defines medicine as including treatment claims. He claimed to be able to treat heart disease. In fact, he drove around with a white van, red letters across the whole side, "We cure heart disease." And the story is, just so you know his age, he flew for the German Air Force in the Second World War. His family—he's from Austria—his family had been traditional healers for four centuries. So he was trained by his grandparents to be a traditional healer.

Now he's working for BC Hydro as an electrical engineer. He has a heart attack. He's rushed to the hospital. He's told that he has one artery completely blocked, another one, three-quarters blocked, and he has to have a double bypass or he's going to die. And he thought—he didn't like that idea. So he went home, and he developed the Strauss heart drops and he treated himself—thirty years later, never having had bypass surgery, he died in an old folks home and not of heart disease.

So then he went into the family business and he's selling these heart drops. And this is why Health Canada was so mad. Then he hires me to defend him. I'm thinking, "Well, the law says you can't make health claims unless you're a doctor, you're making health claims." If I put him on the stand—back then all the judges in Kamloops were older men—I know what would have happened. He would have been on the stand, and he would have looked at the judge: He would have peered. And then he would have pointed. He would have seen the crow's feet, the judge's ears, a sure sign of heart disease. And he would have said, in this Austrian voice, "Your Honour, you have heart disease. You need my heart drops."

So I mean, there's no way—how am I going to defend this guy? And then I reminded myself, "Well, I am a constitutional lawyer. Why don't I attack the law for being unconstitutional?" We were basically going to attack the law for violating freedom of expression. Now this law had been on the books for almost 100 years. If I'm going to convince a judge to strike down a law on freedom of expression—although freedom of expression protects lies—psychologically, I'm going to do better if I can convince the judge that there's truth here. So I go to his little herb shop and I say, "Jim, obviously we don't have any clinical trial evidence. But is there any way we can show that you're telling the truth?" And he literally gives me, I think it was three or four boxes filled of letters that people wrote to him.

I take these back to my office. We're talking thousands and thousands of letters, and they're all the same: I had heart disease. I was sick. I was dying. I took your heart drops. I got well. Now I can't enter that in court; that's pure hearsay. But I can call the authors of those letters. That's the best type of evidence, strongest type of evidence there is. So on the day of trial, I had five middle-class professional witnesses, who had all had heart disease, who had all had at least one open heart bypass surgery—one of them had had two—who had all then continued to have heart disease. And so, they needed another bypass surgery.

Here's where they differed. Some of them were too weak to survive the surgery. So they weren't candidates. They were basically sent home to die. And one way or another, they come across the Strauss heart drops, and they get well. A couple of them, they'd had so many complications from the previous surgery that just to buy another year or two, it wasn't worth it. So they declined the surgery and then they find these heart drops. The most telling thing was—is for years and years and years, none of these people had been able to work. At the day of trial, they were all working full-time. And that was my road to Damascus experience.

You see, because before, when I was working for Health Canada against this man, my belief was it was dangerous to allow people to choose to take a treatment that Health Canada hadn't approved of. That's what it boiled down to. The government hadn't approved it. But after preparing for that trial, my belief was, no—the danger was actually taking away this treatment from people. I could have given you, at that time, the names, phone numbers, and addresses of thousands of people who were only alive because of this product. It just illustrates how dangerous it is for us to give our power to the government and not be allowed to make our own choice. Because the law in Canada is you can't treat a serious health condition like heart disease with something that isn't a chemical pharmaceutical. It's basically the effect of our law. And Health Canada has been taking and taking and taking away products that we would otherwise have the right to choose to use: it violates a very fundamental freedom. So I'll leave us with that.

But most importantly, it violates the second commandment. The second commandment that I talked to you about—treat your neighbour like yourself—that is a touchstone. For you can judge laws: are they valid laws or are they not valid laws? It's not a valid law to say to your neighbour that your neighbour does not have the right to choose how they're going

to treat themselves when they're sick. Or that they don't have the right to choose to take something to prevent themselves from getting sick. That violates fundamental freedom.

[00:30:56]

Final Review and Approval: Margaret Phillips, August 25, 2023.

The evidence offered in this transcript is a true and faithful record of witness testimony given during the National Citizens Inquiry (NCI) hearings. The transcript was prepared by members of a team of volunteers using an "intelligent verbatim" transcription method.

For further information on the transcription process, method, and team, see the NCI website:
<https://nationalcitizensinquiry.ca/about-these-transcripts/>

